

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated May 27, 2010, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

By this response, claims 11 and 18 are hereby amended. No claims are added or canceled. No new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 11 and 15-18 are current pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 11, 15-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr et al. (U.S. Patent 6,391,378) in view of Yamada et al. (U.S. Patent 6,001,203) and further Enchi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,455,099) in view of Levey et al. (U.S. patent 5,409,545) and further Kitahara et al. (U.S. Patent 6,595,819). Further, claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr et al. (U.S. Patent 6,391,378) in view of Yamada et al. (U.S. Patent 6,001,203) and further Enchi et al. (U.S. Patent 6,455,099) in view of Levey et al. (U.S. patent 5,409,545) and further Kitahara et al. (U.S. Patent 6,595,819) and further Vinouze et al. (U.S. Patent 5,431,771).

Claims 11, and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr et al. in view of Yamada et al. and further Enchi et al. in view of Levey et al. and further Kitahara et al. and further Vinouze et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 11 recites a combination of features including, for example, “lowering a body..., wherein the lowering is performed at a first speed;... lifting up the body..., wherein the lifting is performed at a second speed, and wherein the second speed is slower than the first speed;” and “detecting an initial value between the nozzle and the substrate when a state of the contact type switch is switched, wherein the initial value is a height of the nozzle from the substrate when the nozzle is in contact with the substrate, and wherein the detecting the initial value is performed by a laser displacement sensor.”

Claim 18 recites a combination of features including, for example, “lowering a body..., wherein the lowering is performed at a first speed;... lifting up the body,... wherein the lifting is performed at a second speed, and wherein the second speed is slower than the first speed;” and

“detecting an initial value between the nozzle and the substrate when a state of the contact switch is switched, and wherein the detecting the initial value is performed by a laser displacement sensor, wherein the initial value is a height of the nozzle from the substrate when the nozzle is in contact with the substrate.”

Carr et al. in view of Yamada et al. and further Enchi et al. in view of Levey et al. and further Kitahara et al. and further Vinouze et al., alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least these features of the claimed invention.

In particular, the dispensing nozzle 12 of Enchi et al. is lowered in a direction of the arrow B at a constant lowering speed ($V_1 = 200\text{mm/s}$) by the nozzle head robot 13 as recited in col.4, lines 25-30 and shown in Figs. 2a and 2b. Further, the dispensing nozzle 12 is subjected to a first stage raising E at a constant low speed ($V_2 = 5\text{ mm/s}$), and after this first stage raising E has been performed, the dispensing nozzle 12 is subjected to a second stage raising F at a constant high speed ($V_3 = 200\text{ mm/s}$) as recited in col.4, lines 45-54 and shown in Figs. 2a and 2b. Accordingly, in Enchi et al., the constant lowering speed ($V_1 = 200\text{mm/s}$) of the dispensing 12 in a direction of the arrow B is the same speed as the constant high speed ($V_3 = 200\text{ mm/s}$) in a second stage raising F.

As a result, Enchi et al. differs from the claimed invention in view that the “lifting up the body is at a speed slower than a speed of the lowering the body”.

Therefore, Carr et al. in view of Yamada et al. and further Enchi et al. in view of Levey et al. and further Kitahara et al. and further Vinouze et al. fail to teach or suggest “the detecting the initial value is performed by a laser displacement sensor, and wherein the lifting up the body is at a speed slower than a speed of the lowering the body.”

Further, Carr et al. in view of Yamada et al. and further Enchi et al. in view of Levey et al. and further Kitahara et al. and further Vinouze et al. fail to teach or suggest “wherein the initial value is a height of the nozzle from the substrate when the nozzle is in contact with the substrate.”

Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that Carr et al. in view of Yamada et al. and further Enchi et al. in view of Levey et al. and further Kitahara et al. and further Vinouze et al. do not

teach or suggest each and every feature recited in independent claims 11 and 18, as amended. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of independent claims 11 and 18, as amended, be withdrawn. Further, Applicant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejections of dependent claims 15 to 17 be withdrawn at least because of their dependence on independent claim 11, and for additional features that they recite.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned in the event that a telephone interview would expedite consideration of the application.

Dated: August 27, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael P. Alexander

Registration No.: 50,961
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant